

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3-4 and 7-8 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 2, 5-6 and 9-19 are herein amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2, 5-6 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner stated as follows:

Claims 2, 5-6 and 8-19 are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Each of claims 5-6 and 8-19 recites “the method or device.” A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

(Office Action, page 2, lines 16-21).

Accordingly, the rejected claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 2, 5-6, 9-10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (US 2002/0088767 A1).

The Examiner alleged as follows:

Regarding claim 2, Saito teaches supplying molding material to a rotating molding die (figure 9:32) by using a movable rotating drop supply (figure 9:20) that has a drop holding mechanism (figure 9:23-24). The die's movement follows that of the holding mechanism (figure 7: arrows in 20 and 30). The holding mechanism approaches the die in an area where the two paths of rotation overlap or nearly overlap (figure 9: M). There, the holding mechanism inserts the drop into the concavity (figure 11:43) of the female die (figure 9:32).

(Office Action, page 3, lines 13-19).

In the amendment, claim 2 has been amended. Amended claim 2 recites, among other things, “making a following area where the first path and the second path substantially overlaps.”

As shown in Fig. 9 of Saito et al., the path of the grip member 23 and the path of the molding die merely have a contact point, but they do not overlap. Thus, Saito et al. does not teach or suggest “making a following area where the first path and the second path substantially overlaps.”

Also, because Saito et al. does not teach or suggest the “following area,” it also does not teach or suggest “synchronizing the movement of the molding die and the movement of the holding mechanism **in the following area**; carrying the drop by the holding mechanism **to the following area**; and transferring the drop from the holding mechanism to the molding die **in the following area**.”

For at least these reasons, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Saito et al. Claims 5-6, 9-10 and 19, depending from claim 2, also patentably distinguish over Saito et al. for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 11-16 and 18 directly or indirectly depend from claim 2. As discussed above, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Saito et al. The references, Ingram, Winter et al., Suzuki et al., Choinski, Vogel et al., and Zoppas do not disclose the “following area.” Thus, these references do not remedy the deficiencies of Saito et al. discussed above.

For at least these reasons, claim 11-16 and 18 patentably distinguish over Saito, Ingram, Winter et al., Suzuki et al., Choinski, Vogel et al., Zoppas.

The claims further distinguish over these references as follows:

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Patent No. 6,123,880).

Claim 8 depends from withdrawn claims 1 or 3, which has been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Winter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,152,723), henceforth Winter.

In Winter et al., the cam and the cam follower shown in Fig. 7 do not make the paths substantially overlap.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Winter as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,312,437), henceforth Suzuki.

In Suzuki et al., the rocking unit 50 is to move the arms 62 back and forth. The rocking unit has nothing to do with the oscillation as recited in claim 12.

Claim 13/11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Winter as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Choinski (US 2002/0093126 A1). Claim 13/12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Winter and Suzuki as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Choinski.

In Figs. 12-14 of Chouinski, the support does not move along the guide whose angle is varied to set at a specific angle toward the normal line, as recited in claim 13.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Vogel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,514,448 B1), henceforth Vogel.

Vogel et al. discloses nothing about the path “around the eccentric circle.”

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Vogel as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Zoppas (U.S. Patent No. 6,422,379 B1).

The radial extension means has nothing to do with the overlapping of the paths.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Vogel as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Winter and Choinski.

As mentioned above, in Winter et al., the cam and the cam follower shown in Fig. 7 do not make the paths substantially overlap. Also, in Figs. 12-14 of Chouinski, the support does not move along the guide, as recited in claim 16.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above.

As discussed above, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Saito et al.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Application No. 10/564,445
Art Unit: 1791

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No. 062007

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/SADAO KINASHI/

Sadao Kinashi
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,075
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/kn